

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 460

AC 012 488

TITLE [Southeastern Region Adult Basic Education Staff Development Project]; Proceedings of the Evaluation Seminar Held June 5, 6, 1970 in Atlanta, Georgia; [Technical Services Program].

INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 9 Jun 70

NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; Adult Educators; Conference Reports; *Evaluation Techniques; Professional Personnel; Program Evaluation; Seminars; *Staff Improvement; *State Programs; *Summer Institutes; Workshops

IDENTIFIERS *Southeastern Region

ABSTRACT

Materials produced following a seminar held on the orientation to educational evaluation, conducted for ABE Summer Institute directors and allied staff, are provided. This material relates to common perspectives for effective evaluation that can become part of the evaluation methodology used by the summer institute directors. The planning for the two-day instructional session, the workshop program, an overview of evaluation, a hypothetical evaluation exercise, and material developed are presented in the proceedings. Attachments are: (1) Overall Reaction to the Evaluation Workshop; (2) Seminar Individual Information Sheet; (3) Seminar Cognitive Information Inventory; (4) Sample Items Developed by Seminar Group--Personal Data Inventory, Participant Input, Director Input; and (5) List of Seminar Participants. (DB)

Southern Regional Education Board

130 Sixth Street, N. W. • Atlanta, Georgia 30313 • 404 872-3873

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 060460

MEMORANDUM

TO: State ABE Directors and Project Staff

FROM: Regional Staff

DATE: June 9, 1970

SUBJECT: Proceedings of the Evaluation Seminar held June 5,6, 1970 in Atlanta, Georgia.

Attached are the proceedings of the orientation to educational evaluation which was conducted for institute directors and allied staff as a part of the Technical Services Program of the Staff Development Project. This material, produced immediately following the June 5th and 6th meeting relates to common perspectives for effective evaluation that can become part of the evaluation methodology used by the summer institute directors.

884 210 12 488

Introduction

Charge to Consultants

The process and components of institute evaluation have been a continuing concern of both the regional project staff, adult education state staffs, and project personnel in the participating states. The need for a seminar to discuss these concerns had been recognized as a legitimate part of the Technical Services Program.

This need was underlined and emphasized because of the Office of Education's plans for evaluating project activities and summer activities in our states through their nationwide assessment grants. As a result, the regional staff moved rapidly to sponsor an abbreviated seminar to examine principles and theory of educational program evaluation. A two-day program was planned primarily for directors of the 13 summer institutes or the person who might be designated by him to conduct evaluation. State directors were invited to send a member of their staff, as was each participating institution, so that maximum utilization of the evaluation techniques that were developed would result.

The program format was drawn from similar activities conducted at the University of Virginia. Professor Virgil Ward had conducted these more extensive programs and was contacted to ascertain if he could bring to bear the core of those efforts upon the problems of evaluation in the ABE institutes.

Professor Ward indicated that a short program could be developed and agreed to act as chief consultant. The limitations of time and pressure were acknowledged, as the chief consultant in collaboration with

Associate Professor Jeff A. Pyatte of the University of West Florida, began to plan a two-day instructional session.

The consultants were pleased to accept the opportunity to work with the project staff in the light of the following explicit understandings:

- (1) That the maximum results expected to occur from such a short session would be an appreciation for the importance of evaluation and a better acceptance of evaluation responsibilities
- (2) That appreciation for the importance of some concentration on the principles and theory of educational program evaluation, no matter how hastily concocted, would probably result in some degree of improvement in the conduct of evaluation responsibilities of the respective directors or evaluators, over that likely otherwise to emerge
- (3) That the suggestive "design" or model and instruments around which the orientation experience evolved would be acknowledged as less than perfect, though hopefully essentially valid
- (4) That the report that emanated from the learning experience be confined to an "in-house" paper, summarizing proceedings for the convenience of the participants involved, and not for general distribution.

Rationale

Within the allowable limits discussed with the regional staff, the principal consultant began to conceptualize overall feasibilities for a two-day orientation experience in educational program evaluation. His first move was to obtain schedule clearance for participation in the seminar of a colleague (associate consultant) with whom he had worked in similar functions.

Their first considerations were feasible aspects of training programs which could be accomplished within a very short period. The second considerations were focused on the objectives of the program. The following specific points were examined:

1. Should the training experience evolve around one or more systematic theoretical models for evaluation? Or should it involve an eclectic synthesis with foreseeable direct applicability to the ABE institutes?
2. Should the training experience be developed around general principles and practices of evaluation, or, to the contrary, around an illustrative model designed for the purpose of this particular orientation?
3. Should the objective of the orientation be instruction in the techniques of program evaluation from which principles and practices, each director would design his own evaluation plan, or should the orientation program take the form of a preconceived plan feasible for actual implementation?

The resulting deliberations between the consultants and the regional staff will be indicated in the description of the workshop program which follows.

In another aspect of preplanning the consultants, in continuing discussions with staff, determined that certain overall characteristics of the training experience should prevail:

1. The training experience should be practical in nature rather than theoretical. Such principles as might be needed were to be included in explanations of the practical patterns and techniques to be discussed.

2. That all activities within the training program should be made explicitly visible with respect to nature and purpose. This discipline was to acknowledge that hasty, ad hoc techniques drawn from the complex matrix of evaluation theory would, at best, be imperfect and that sound instructional gains would come from explicitly acknowledging these abrogations of valid principles and techniques.
3. That the training program itself should be organized as an explicit simulation exercise in educational program evaluation. This feature of the program would be an "object lesson" in this sense: what was being suggested by way of an evaluation pattern would be recycled into the instructional program through the simulation exercise.

As the third aspect of the rationale, the consultants determined principal constraints affecting this training experience:

1. The severe limits in time necessitated unrefined, though essentially valid presentations.
2. The instructional pattern (the presentation of substantive material) should be illustrative of an approach to adult learning that all regional institutes could take.
3. Neither the consultants nor institute directors themselves would be able to either (a) select and obtain published instruments essential to the suggested design, nor (b) construct such instruments to meet conventional criteria of reliability and validity in the time allowed for the seminar.

It was thought that carrying through a whole plan for evaluation, one systematically conceptualized in form and essentially valid in content, would supercede the value of imperfect instrumentation, provided that the imperfections were recognized and that the impossibility of definitive inferences and appraisals from such ad hoc instrumentation were deeply and pervasively realized.

Workshop Program

Perspectives on Evaluation. Preparation for the evaluation task is necessary to infuse vigor and substance within many educational endeavors. Too many educators are unprepared for the definiteness of the evaluation task. An expanded group of professionals in this area is necessary. This was a theoretical basis for the evaluation activity that was undertaken at this meeting.

Objectives. Within the constraints indicated above, the following choice was made: To provide an instructional session for the directors in the principles of educational evaluation, these principles to be incorporated into the form of a conceptualized structure (plan, designer, model) for the evaluation of a short term educational or training experience; and that this objective would be implemented through two pervasive features of the immediate workshop orientation. (a) that the suggestive pattern would be made visible, and explained at every step under the invited posture for directors to "take or leave". (b) that participant involvement would be systematically sought, in increasing degree as the two-days advanced, the purpose being to familiarize and to practice the directors in constructing the substance within each principal category and feature of the illustrative evaluative model comprising the core of the orientation session. (c) that a simulation experience composed of actually

using the plan or design being described as instruction (with instruments hastily constructed for the purpose of substantive focus or evaluation, not adult education techniques) would add to the effectiveness of the instructional process.

Overview of Evaluation.

Objectives of Evaluation

1. Among many purposes, evaluation may be conducted

1. To improve on-going programs.
2. To rate one project against others.
3. To assess the merit of a terminated activity.
4. To provide counsel for work about to begin.
5. To provide valid principles generalizable to other similar efforts.
6. To record fully the story of a particular educational effort.

2. Requirements for an Evaluation

1. An evaluation must be executed according to a systematic plan.
2. An evaluation plan must include several independent components which can be used as internal checks on the final judgment rendered.
3. An evaluation plan must include clearly identified criterion measures for variables providing basic data for the final judgment.
4. An evaluation plan must include clearly identified and clearly defined criteria for judgements which provide basic data for the final judgement.
5. An evaluation plan must have clearly defined methods and procedures for executing the methods.

6. An evaluation plan must account for all relevant variables feasible under the conditions for the evaluation.
7. An evaluation plan must provide for periodic assessment and must make provisions for modification at any time the results of the assessment indicate the need for it.
8. An evaluation plan must include a provision for reporting results in a usable form.
9. An evaluation plan must be clearly focused on specific objectives.

3. The Model

Definition of Evaluation

Evaluation: The deliberate act of gathering and processing information according to some rational plan, the purpose of which is to render at some point in time a judgement about the worth of that on which the information was collected.

Elements of the Definition

1. The object of the evaluation, that which is being evaluated.
2. The agent of the evaluation, that which does the evaluating.
3. The inputs for the evaluation, the information to be collected.
4. The plan for the evaluation, the rational process through which the inputs are put.
5. The time of the evaluation, either formative, summative, or continuous.
6. The "multi-purpose" product of the evaluation, the form which the final judgement takes.

The Object of the Evaluation

The object of the evaluation is that which is being evaluated, that about which the judgement is being made.

The following questions about the object are appropriate:

What is the nature of the object?

Is it a learner? Is it a sequence of courses? Is it an entire school program?

Where does the object fit into the structure of education?

Is it at the elementary level? Is it at the secondary level? Is it at the college level? Is it post-college?

At what level in governmental organization is the object?

Is it local, state, regional, national?

The Agent of the Evaluation

The agent is the person or body which renders the judgement. The following questions about the agent are appropriate?

Is the agent a single person, a body of persons, or a combination?

Is the agent a student? Is the agent a teacher, a principal, a board? Is the agent a legislative committee? Is the agent some combination, for example, a college president and a legislative committee?

Where does the agent fit into the structure of education?

Is the agent above the object in the structure? Is the agent below the object? Is the agent at the same level as the object?

Where is the agent in the governmental organization?

What staff will the agent be provided?

What funds will the agent be provided?

What policies will the agent follow?

How will the agent evaluate his evaluation?

The Inputs for the Evaluation

The inputs are the elements of information which go into the evaluation plan. They provide the basis upon which the agent

renders the judgement about the object of the evaluation. The following questions about the inputs are appropriate:

What will be the source of the inputs? Will it be teachers? Students? Principals? Parents?

Will the inputs be objective (measured), or descriptive (subjective), or a combination? Will they be standardized test results? Will they be measures of discrepancies between objectives and performance? Will they be the results of inventories?

What will be the instruments for providing the inputs? Will they be tests? Inventories? Opinions?

Will there be a sampling procedure used in providing the inputs?

Will testing be done on a sampling basis? Will opinion be sampled?

Under what conditions will the inputs be provided?

What will be the schedule for providing the inputs?

How will the inputs be organized for retrieval and processing?

The Plan for the Evaluation

The plan for the evaluation is the rational process through which the inputs go before they are translated into bases for making the judgement. The following questions about the plan are appropriate:

What are the objectives of the evaluation? (See: Objective of Evaluations).

What is the nature of the inputs? Will there be measures? Will there be judgements? Will there be incidental inputs?

Will there be statistical procedures employed?

For what levels of judgement will information be needed?

Will the product of the evaluation go to different persons?

What criteria will be used in rendering the judgement?

What are the relevant variables involved?

What are the criterion variables?

What analyses will be employed?

What interpretations will be given the data collected?

Who will be in charge of data analysis?

The Time of the Evaluation

The time of the evaluation has to do with whether the judgement will be rendered during the developmental stages, of the object of the evaluating at the termination of some phase at which a unit can be considered to have been accomplished, or continuously. Appropriate questions relating to time are:

Will the evaluation be formative, summative, or continuous?

Does the time correspond with scheduling demands?

What is the schedule for the total evaluation?

The Product of the Evaluation

The product of the evaluation is the judgement rendered. It is the administration of the evaluation. Appropriate questions about the product are:

At what level will the judgement be made?

What effect does the judgement have?

Is it to determine effectiveness?

Is it to determine resource allocation?

Is it to determine whether continuation of a program is desirable?

Is it to guide in appropriations of monies?

What form will the judgement take?

Will it be a report, a grade, a certificate?

What means will be used to provide it?

What alternatives to the object (program, etc.) of the evaluation exist?

To what audiences will the judgement be disseminated?

When will the judgement be rendered?

Will the judgement be periodically updated or is it final?

Is the judgement a tentative one?

How critical is the judgement?

Hypothetical Evaluation Exercise

The Example

Three high school science teachers have written a programmed instructional sequence on the metric system. Their decision to write it was the result of their consensus that much time was wasted in science classes going over the system for the few students who did not know it. A programmed instructional sequence could, if available, be given to only those students who were unfamiliar with the metric system. It would, therefore, add to the time available for topics of greater importance.

The teachers used the following plan in writing the programmed sequence:

1. Specification of the terminal skills desired
2. Construction of frames in linear format to develop each of the skills
3. Construction of test situations to determine whether the skills had been achieved upon completion of the programmed sequence.

The three teachers wanted to try the sequence and render some judgement about its success. They wanted to know specifically:

1. Did the sequence enable the learner to develop the desired skills?
2. If some skills were not developed, which skills and why?
3. Was the time taken less than the two hours of class time required to cover the skills included in the sequence?
4. What was the attitude of the students toward the sequence?

The programmed sequence was tested in the following way:

1. Students were administered a test consisting of test situations selected from those constructed to determine whether the desired skills had been developed by the program

2. Students who failed to reach the 90% achievement level on the items were given the programmed sequence
3. The beginning time was recorded
4. The ending time was recorded
5. The test was re-administered and scored
 - a. Students were asked to express in writing their opinion of the sequence.

The teachers found, as they required,

1. That there was in every case an improvement in the performance on the test after completion of the programmed sequence.
2. Only 5% of the demanded 90% of the students failed to reach the 90% level of achievement on the last administration of the test.
3. Of the skills required, only conversion from one system to another was not successfully taught to at least 50% of students.
4. The maximum amount of time required to complete the sequence was 90 minutes; the maximum amount of time was 20 minutes, and the mean time was 32 minutes.
5. The girls reacted favorably to the sequence; the boys unfavorably.

The metric system, the teachers found, could be taught more efficiently by using the programmed sequence. They decided that the sequence was highly successful for girls but of questionable success for boys. There was a need for revision of the frames or conversion. A new sequence was needed for boys.

The Analysis of the Example According to the Overview of Evaluation

Object: The programmed instructional sequence on the metric system

Agent: The three science teachers

- Inputs:
1. Scores on test administered prior to sequence
 2. Scores on test administered after sequence
 3. Beginning and ending times
 4. Written student opinions

Objective: Improving ongoing programs

Plan:

1. Improvement was required of all students
2. 90% of the students were required to achieve 90% on the final test
3. All skills must be taught to at least 50% of the students
4. The skills must be taught in less than 120 minutes

Time: FormativeProduct: Decision

The programmed sequence is successful but needs minor revision.

Material Developed

The suggested pattern and process of evaluation took the form of an eclectic design. It was mutually agreed that the illustrative patterns and examples developed during the seminar were only suggestive and were by no means representative of finished products that could be used by directors for evaluative purposes. The fact was also emphasized that the entire process was suggestive and not mandatory.

Participants contributed greatly to the model instrumentation that evolved from group work sessions. Four areas were identified as input categories needed for evaluation:

1. Feedback from participants
2. Feedback from directors
3. Affective information
4. Cognitive information

Rough samples of these four categories were used during the simulation exercise wherein evaluation of the evaluation seminar took place. The rough samples mentioned were merely suggestive and served to provoke thought on the part of the participants to develop their own guidelines and illustrations of instruments that would meet their evaluation needs relative to their summer institutes. To this end the seminar participants were grouped to consider inventory items for each of the four categories that would meet their particular needs for evaluating their summer institutes.

The inventory items that were developed are included with this material. These items are rough and are included to remind the participants of the examples they developed. This we hope will help them to focus clearly on what their specific instrumentation needs are in light of the seminar outcomes.

The participants indicated that the two-day seminar had been an informative and meaningful experience. Their reactions to the overall seminar pointed up the fact that the content used during the seminar was very relevant and useful; they indicated that the material presented during the seminar was well done and they all voiced interest and appreciation for the experiences afforded them during the two-days of the seminar.

Dr. Brown, the director of the SREB ABE project, concluded the seminar by re-emphasizing the fact that the two-day seminar had been purely designed as an instructional device and that none of the outcomes were intended to be imposed on the institute directors. The primary hope, he stated, was that the seminar would be helpful to the institute directors in improving and implementing their evaluation plans for their respective summer institutes.

The fact that three regional consultants will be available to provide certain types of assistance through the technical assistance program of the project was also emphasized in Dr. Brown's remarks. These consultants, Dr. Jack Blakeman, University of Georgia; Dr. Pearl Gunter, Tennessee State University; and Dr. Emmett Kohler, Mississippi State University; may be obtained through requests from institute directors to Dr. Brown.

The seminar was adjourned with the understanding that a follow-up meeting with the seminar participants would be held in later summer or early fall to discuss further evaluation activities and explore the feasibility of a regional approach to institute evaluation based on experiences that evolve from subsequent summer institute evaluation activities.

Attachments

1. Overall Reaction to the Evaluation Workshop
2. Seminar Individual Information Sheet
3. Seminar Cognitive Information Inventory
4. Sample Items Developed by Seminar Group
Personal Data Inventory
Participant Input
Director Input
5. List of Seminar Participants

INSTRUMENTS OF EVALUATION

Overall Reaction (affective) to the Evaluation Workshop

Educational activities are considered more valuable in outcome if they yield gains both in understanding and skills (cognitive, behavioral) and in attitudinal and emotional characteristics (affective domain). The usefulness of cognitive gains is apparent. The concern for affective gains acknowledges that when one is positively affected (appreciative, interested) he will try harder to use well what he has learned. Certain reactions have been requested to aid in ascertaining what has been learned. This terminal reaction is intended to obtain from each participant the best possible representation of his introspective feelings about the training process. Your careful reaction and comment will be helpful. The form is designed to allow quantification of responses.

In comparison to the attitudes and expectations with which I came, the workshop in total effect served

- () to increase my interest and appreciation for educational evaluation
- () to affect my interest and appreciation but slightly either way
- () to decrease interest and appreciation

The workshop leaders in my opinion

- () were satisfactorily aware of the feelings of the group and individuals
- () were largely insensitive to the "human factor"
- () were somewhere between these two extremes

My own efforts to maintain good affect in my workshop are likely to be

- () distinctly superior to those here
- () about as effective as these, give or take a bit
- () perhaps a little less effective on the whole

Altogether:

- () I liked the experience more than I disliked it
- () I disliked the experience more than I liked it

Comment: Summary Reaction . . .

Individual Information

Workshop No. _____

Sex: ☐ M ☐ FAge: ☐ Under 30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41 or overEducational Experience: (teaching, supervision, administration)☐ Under 4 years ☐ 4-10 years ☐ 11 or moreProfessional Training: Highest Degree Earned☐ AB ☐ Master's ☐ DoctoralPlease check one statement in each group below

- ☐ I know very little about systematic educational program evaluation -- never had a course, never attended an in-service training session.
- ☐ I have had some training, and done some reading, to the point of at least elementary understanding about the theory, design and techniques of evaluation.
- ☐ I have had some research training (testing, statistics, methodology), with incidental bearing on evaluation, and can count on considerable transfer value.
-
- ☐ Frankly, my attitudes are rather negativistic; I doubt the value of what we can or will do in these two-days.
- ☐ I'm willing, but not overly enthusiastic or optimistic about the value of this orientation session.
- ☐ I'm enthusiastic. I need anything I can get on the subject.

Cognitive Information

PART I

1. As a process, evaluation almost always involves
 - a. comparisons of control and experimental groups
 - b. comparisons of beginning and ending status
 - c. contrasts between low achievers and high
 - d. contrasts between two different ways of achieving objectives (at least two ways)

2. Which of the following activities is least "evaluative" in nature?
 - a. the merit rating of teachers
 - b. the awarding of athletic scholarships
 - c. the classroom teacher's test
 - d. the estimation of which of two football teams will win
 - e. deciding which horse to bet on

3. In assuring the effectiveness of an activity, one of the following is a more fundamental requirement than others.
Which?
 - a. that anticipated outcomes predetermine objectives
 - b. that objectives be envisioned in terms of outcomes
 - c. that procedures be commensurate with processes
 - d. that objectives and processes be efficiently related to anticipated outcomes

4. The most distinctive feature of evaluation among the following is:
 - a. insistence that an external judge must observe and assign worth
 - b. insistence that pre-and post-measures be systematically incorporated into the design
 - c. insistence that the purpose or objective of the thing to be evaluated is clearly spelled out
 - d. insistence that norms be validated well in advance

5. The principal purpose of the contemporary evaluation movement is:
 - a. to assess student achievement more validly
 - b. to improve the process through which we develop textbooks and learning aids
 - c. to ascertain whether the purposes of a given activity were carried out

6. Evaluation differs from measurement in that
 - a. evaluation may incorporate measurement
 - b. evaluation involves judgement
 - c. evaluation may apply to phenomena that cannot be measured (precisely)
 - d. all of the above
7. A good evaluator
 - a. must believe in the significance of the product or activity he is evaluating
 - b. must be as neutral as possible with respect to what he is evaluating
 - c. must form judgements as to the significance of an activity according to how effectively it is carried out
 - d. must appraise an activity accurately regardless of how insignificant it may be
8. Evaluation differs from research in
 - a. objective or purpose
 - b. procedure and technique
 - c. setting or context
 - d. all of the above
 - e. none of the above (that is research and evaluation do not differ essentially in any of these respects)
9. Evaluation as a concept implies
 - a. ascertaining the worth of something
 - b. comparing something with something else
 - c. ascertaining differences and similarities among several similar activities or products
 - d. making decisions about what activity would be most worthy
10. The broadest purpose underlying evaluation activity is
 - a. to aid in meeting educational responsibilities
 - b. to aid in ascertaining greatest economy in educational programs
 - c. to aid in learning more about planning educational programs
 - d. to aid in meeting individual differences among learners

PART II

1. Write out a definition of evaluation.

2. (a) A definition of evaluation includes elements. For example, the thing which is being evaluated is an element of a definition of evaluation you just gave, list as many elements as you can.

(b) Beside each element, explain very briefly what it means.

3. A good evaluation should meet a set of predetermined criteria. It should, for example, have clearly defined objectives. List as many such requirements for an evaluation as you are able.

4. Given the following description of a hypothetical evaluation, identify in it the elements which you have listed.

For an evaluation of their high school physics course a group of high school science teachers collected:

1. grades in high school physics
2. grades in other science courses
3. scores on a standardized physics test
4. complaints from students about physics

The teachers collected this information at the conclusion of the physics course. If the grades in physics corresponded to the grades in other science courses, if scores on the standardized test were high, and if complaints about physics were few, they agreed, the physics course would be judged successful. Otherwise, the course would be judged to be in need of revision. On the basis of the information collected, the teachers decided that the physics course was successful.

Guideline for personal data inventory on participants

Age

Sex

Educational Background

Area of Major Preparation

Experience in ABE Programs

Geographical Location

Full-time or Part-time

Status (directors, principals, teachers)

PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

A=Agree D=Disagree N=Not applicable

Physical Facilities:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|--|
| A | D | N | 1. | Adequate space was provided for large group meetings. |
| A | D | N | 2. | Adequate space was provided for small group discussions. |
| A | D | N | 3. | The physical climate was conducive for instructional purposes. |
| A | D | N | 4. | The accommodations for the participants were adequate. |
| A | D | N | 5. | The instructional media was adequate (audio-visual aids etc.) |

Purposes:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|---|
| A | D | N | 1. | The purposes of the institute were relevant to the needs of the participants. |
| A | D | N | 2. | The purposes of the institute were clearly defined to the participants. |
| A | D | N | 3. | The purposes of the institute were implemented. |
| A | D | N | 4. | The participants had an opportunity to contribute to the development of the content of the institute. |
| A | D | N | 5. | Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants. |

Program:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|---|
| A | D | N | 1. | The content of the institute was relevant. |
| A | D | N | 2. | The program was in harmony with the stated purposes of the institute. |
| A | D | N | 3. | The methods employed were effective. |
| A | D | N | 4. | The consultants were effective. |
| A | D | N | 5. | The program was sufficiently flexible. |
| A | D | N | 6. | A variety of methods were utilized. |

- A D N 7. The program did effect an attitude of group cohesiveness.
- A D N 8. Adequate time was available for the purposes of the institute to be realized.
- A D N 9. My performance as an ABE teacher has been enhanced as a result of attending this institute.
- A D N 10. The institute was held at a convenient time for the participants.

AN EVALUATIVE
INSTRUMENT
FOR
DIRECTOR
AND
STAFF
OF ABE
INSTITUTE

I. Object

Who determined the purpose of the workshop?

Participants role
State Department
Combinations

What is the general purpose:

What are the specific objectives?

How are audiences desires finally accomodated?

How were the roles of the director decided? Who is the director? Why was he chosen?

II. Inputs

A. Were facilities adequate? Did they aid the accomplishment of the objectives?

parking
food
housing
off-hours
adequacy of time usage during the institute

B. Participants

Who attended?

What characteristics of the group are evident?

How were unique value patterns accomodated or not accomodated?

Who attended and who determined who could attend?

C. Materials

What was used?

Was it used effectively?

What other ways can they be used?

D. Staff

Was the staff adequate for the institutes purposes?

Were they able to make adjustments to fit circumstances?

E. Financing

What is the per unit cost?

How was the budget developed?

What are the different sources of providing financing for institutes?

IV. Who composed the planning group for the institutes?

To what degree were participants and consultants included in the planning process?

How are state-wide needs and developments served by the institute?

How well are those involved knowledgeable of the tentative nature of funding for ABE Institutes due to federal process?

V. Time

Was the time devoted to the planning of the institute adequate?

How long?

1. Less than 2 months
2. 2-4 months
3. 4-6 months

What is a desirable timetable after your experience?

VI. Product

Did your affective and cognitive evaluations show that expected accomplishments were realistic, adequate, etc.?

Have later follow-ups beyond the close of the institute been planned for?

Items for Securing Participant Inputs

1. Content

a. Appropriate

Inappropriate

(Comments)

Why did you rate it in this manner?

b. Useful

Not useful

(Comments)

Why did you rate it in this manner?

2. Presentation

a. Effective

Ineffective

(Comments)

Why did you rate it in this manner?

3. Usage Areas

Content

- a. Inappropriate -- Modify to bring home point
- b. Useful -- May have misjudged to get audiences

Presentation

- a. Media preference
- b. Feedback to presentor
- c. May be able to re-cycle during institute for different media

Terminal

EVALUATION SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

June 5-6, 1970

Dr. Hilton Bonniwell Project Coordinator	Georgia Southern College Statesboro
Miss Polly Claiborne Supervisor	Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta
Mr. Allen Code Project Coordinator	South Carolina State College Orangeburg
Dr. Donnie Dutton Project Coordinator	Memphis State University Memphis
Mr. Luke Easter Supervisor	Tennessee State Department of Education, Nashville
Dr. James Farrell Project Coordinator	Tennessee State University Nashville
Mr. Bill Fowler Graduate Student	University of Tennessee Knoxville
Mrs. Flora Fowler Graduate Student	University of Tennessee Knoxville
Dr. Harry Frank Project Coordinator	Auburn University Auburn
Mr. Leon Hornsby Supervisor	Alabama State Department of Education, Montgomery
Dr. Arthur Madry Project Coordinator	Florida A & M Tallahassee
Mr. Robert Marshall Project Coordinator	Albany State College Albany
Mrs. Vivian Morris Project Director	Alabama A & M Huntsville
Dr. Marshall Morrison Project Coordinator	Alabama State University Montgomery

EVALUATION SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

June 5-6, 1970

Dr. Hilton Bonniwell Project Coordinator	Georgia Southern College Statesboro
Miss Polly Claiborne Supervisor	Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta
Mr. Allen Code Project Coordinator	South Carolina State College Orangeburg
Dr. Donnie Dutton Project Coordinator	Memphis State University Memphis
Mr. Luke Easter Supervisor	Tennessee State Department of Education, Nashville
Dr. James Farrell Project Coordinator	Tennessee State University Nashville
Mr. Bill Fowler Graduate Student	University of Tennessee Knoxville
Mrs. Flora Fowler Graduate Student	University of Tennessee Knoxville
Dr. Harry Frank Project Coordinator	Auburn University Auburn
Mr. Leon Hornsby Supervisor	Alabama State Department of Education, Montgomery
Dr. Arthur Madry Project Coordinator	Florida A & M Tallahassee
Mr. Robert Marshall Project Coordinator	Albany State College Albany
Mrs. Vivian Morris Project Director	Alabama A & M Huntsville
Dr. Marshall Morrison Project Coordinator	Alabama State University Montgomery

Mrs. Kathryn Mosley
Project Coordinator

Jackson State College
Jackson

Mr. Tom Sills

West Georgia College, Carrollton

Mr. William Smith

South Carolina State Department
of Education, Columbia

Dr. Robert Snyder
Project Coordinator

University of South Carolina
Columbia

REGIONAL CONSULTANTS:

Dr. Jack Blakeman

University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Pearl Gunter

Tennessee State University
Nashville

Dr. Emmett Kohler

Mississippi State University
State College

SREB STAFF:

Dr. Edward Brown
Project Director

Adult Basic Education Project
Atlanta

Dr. Charles E. Kozoll
Associate Director

Adult Basic Education Project
Atlanta

Dr. Preston Torrence
Associate Director

Adult Basic Education Project
Atlanta

CONSULTANTS:

Dr. Jeff Pyatte

University of West Florida
Pensacola

Dr. Virgil Ward

University of Virginia
Charlottesville